PROJECT 10073 RECORD CARD

1. DATE	2. LOCATION		12. CONCLUSIONS
30 November 1957 3. DATE-TIME GROUP Local GMT 30/1020Z S. PHOTOS CYes XD No	17 Mi S Of Mir 4. TYPE OF OBSERVATION Ground-Visual Air-Visual 6. SOURCE Military	N XC Ground-Rodor D Air-Intercept Rador	D Was Aircraft D Probably Aircraft
7. LENGTH OF OBSERVATION 20 seconds	8. NUMBER OF OBJECTS	9. COURSE	D Insufficient Data for Evaluation Unknown
Visual one inch blip on HRI, climbed from 5,000 ft to 25,000 ft in 20 seconds. Traveled 100 miles in 20 seconds when it faded from HRI.		It is concluded that possibility object is a false target due to equipment malfunction rather than an actual target caused the rptd radar paint.	

ATIC FORM 329 (REV 26 SEP 52)

30 Nov 5? 14 51 2 RBØ67 SQF 095 YDA 099 XYA173 XDD 071 EGUA 036 PP RJEDDN RJEDWP RJEPHQ DE RJWPGU 3H P 301210Z FM COMDR 786TH ACWRON TO RJWPGU/ COMDR 29TH ADIV RJEDWP/COMDR AIR TECHNICAL INTELL CENTER RJEPHQ/DIRECTOR OF INTELL HDQ USAF RJEDDNXCOMDR AIR DEFENSE COMMAND ENT AFB BT UNCLASSIFIED/FROM 786TH OPERATIONS UFOB 1. (A) VISUAL PRESENTATION ON HRI FPS-6

(B) N/A

(C) N/A

(D) ONE

(E) N/A

(F) ONE INCH BLIP ON HRI

(H) N/A

e. Inclosure #5: There are several unusual things about this reported / UFOB sighting. First, the equipment was evidently under control of maintenance personnel at the time of sighting. This could mean that the radar equipment was not in perfect adjustment, or some sort of target simulator or other special equipment was being used in connection with the maintenance operation. (There is no mention of this in the report, however.) Also, the report gives no indication of any attempt to rotate the antenna to a new bearing to determine whether the signal originated inside the equipment. (This question arises since the azimuth of the target was reported to be exactly the same throughout the time of interception and, therefore, appears to indicate that the antenna was not rotating.) Further, regular operating personnel are generally more familiar with the appearance of a particular radar scope and could possibly be more reliable observers than maintenance personnel. Hence, it is concluded that possibly a false target due to equipment malfunction rather than an actual target caused the reported radar paint.

PAGE TWO RJWPGU 3H

(I) CLIMBED FROM 5,000 FEET TO 25,000 FEET IN TWENTY (20)

SECOND, TRAVELED 100 MILES IN TWENTY (20) SECOND.

- 2. (A) APPEARED ON HRI- FPS-6.
 - (B) 5,000 FEET 207 DEGREES AT 80 MILES
 - (C) 25,000 FEET 207 DEGREES AT 180 MILES
 - (D) STRAIGHT LINE
 - (E) FADE FROM HRI
 - (F) TWENTY SECONDS
- 5. (A) GROUND ELECTRONIC HRI (FPS-6
 - (B) N/A
 - (C) N/A
- 4. (A) TIME AND DATE OF SIGHTINV
 - (A) 1020Z 30 NOV 57
 - (B) NIGHT
- 5. (A) 17 MILES SOUTH OF MINOT N.D. 786TH ACW SQ.
- 6. (A) N/A
 - (B) A/2C CHARLES A, WAGNER. 786TH ACW SQ. RADAR MAINTENUNCE FIVE
- (5) MONTH EXPERIENCE.
- 7. N/A
- 8. NEGATIVE

3.	(A) GROUND ELECTRONIC HRI (FPS-6	(
	(B) N/A.		
	(C) N/A	(
4.	(A) TIME AND DATE OF SIGHTINV		
	(A) 10207 30 NOV 57		
	(B) NIGHT	(
5.	(A) 17 MILES SOUTH OF MINOT N.D. 786TH ACW SQ.		
6.	(A) N/A		
	(B) A/2C CHARLES A, WAGNER. 786TH ACW SQ. RADAR MAINTENUNCE FIVE	(
(5)	MONTH EXPERIENCE.	,	
7. 1	N/A	`	
8. 1	NEGATIVE		
		(
>			
		(
PAG	E THREE RJWPGU 3H	(
9.	N/A		
10.	NONE		
11. SENIOR DIRECTOR, 786TH ACW SQ, POSSIBILITY OF INTERFERENCE			
ON SCOPE WAS CHECKED WITH RADAR MAINTENANCE, NEGATIVE INTERFERENCE.			
	N/A		
вт		(
	AFCIN-AE-1 Comments / Conclusions:		
		(
		,	
		. 1	

1100

Signed.

** **/ *